

United States Supreme Court,
FILED

JAN 17 1920

JAMES D. MAHER
CLERK

IN THE
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

IN THE OCTOBER 1919 TERM

NUMBER 196 (26723).

THE NEW YORK CENTRAL RAILROAD
COMPANY,

Petitioner,

vs.

WILBUR H. MOHNEY,

Respondent.

BRIEF OF RESPONDENT.

MILLER, MILLER, BRADY & SEELEY,
Attorneys for Respondent

A. JAY MILLER,
ALBERT H. MILLER,
CHARLES H. BRADY,
Of Counsel.

**The Toledo Legal Printing Co.,
436 Huron Street,
Toledo, Ohio**

INDEX.

	PAGE
All Passes Are Not Free Passes.....	25
Argument.	12
Care—Mohney Entitled to Some Degree of.....	33
Conclusion.	44
Consideration, Valuable—Mohney Pass Issued for..	24
Court to Find Degree of Negligence	36
Defense of Fog Abandoned Below	36
Degree of Negligence for Court to Find.....	36
Employment Was Back of Mohney Pass.....	29
Exempting Clause Invalid in Federal Courts.....	42
Exempting Clause Invalid in Ohio.....	37
Exempting Clause Invalid in Other States.....	39
Federal Courts—Exempting Clause Invalid in.....	42
Fog, Defense of—Abandoned Below.....	36
Free Passes—All Passes Are Not.....	25
Gross, Wanton and Willful Negligence.....	35
Hepburn Act Does Not Apply.....	12
History of Action	2
Intrastate Journey—Mohney on.....	13
Intrastate, Pass is—Regardless of Journey.....	18
Intrastate Transportation—State Regulates.....	21
Law of Ohio Controls	41
Mohney Entitled to Some Degree of Care.....	33
Mohney on Intrastate Journey.....	13
Mohney Pass Based on Employment.....	29
Mohney Pass Issued for Value	24
Negligence, Degree of—For Court to Find.....	36
Ohio—Exempting Clause Invalid in.....	37
Ohio Law Controls.....	41
Pass Intrastate, Regardless of Journey.....	18
Passes, All—Are Not Free Passes.....	25
Propositions Involved	9
State Law Regulates State Transportation.....	21
Statement of the Case.....	3
Wanton and Willful Negligence.....	35

INDEX—CONT'D.

CASES CITED.

	PAGE
Annas vs. Railway, 67 Wis., 46.....	40
Chicago, etc., Ry. vs. Maucher, Lawyers' Co-op. Adv. Sheets for 2-1-19, page 122 (U. S. Sup. Ct.)....	34
C., H. & D. Ry. vs. Pontius, 19 O. S., 221, 235.....	39
Doyle vs. Fitchburg R. R., 166 Mass., 492.....	29
Dugan vs. Blue Hill Ry., 193 Mass., 431.....	30
Eberts vs. R. R., 151 Mich., 260.....	31
Gill vs. R. R., 135 N. Y. Supp., 355.....	30
Gill vs. R. R., 135 N. Y. Supp., 355.....	39
Gulf, etc., Ry. vs. Texas, 204 U. S., 403.....	21
Harris vs. Puget Sound R. R., 52 Wash., 289.....	31
Hepburn Act (34 Stat. at L. P. 584 or Comp. Stat. §8563 et seq.)	12
Hepburn Act (34 Stat. at L. P. 584 or Comp. Stat. §8563 et seq.)	28
Hepburn Act (34 Stat. at L. P. 584 or Comp. Stat. §8563 et seq.)	41
Hope, etc., Co. vs. Texas, etc., Ry., 10 I. C. R., 696, 703.....	21
Hughes vs. Penn. R. R., 63 L. R. A. (Penn.), 513, 527.	42
Hughes vs. Penn. R. R., 202 Pa., 222.....	42
Ind. Traction Co. vs. Isgrig, 181 Ind., 211.....	31
Judson on Interstate Commerce, page 15, par. 1.....	20
Knowlton vs. Ry., 19 O. S., 260, 263.....	39
Knowlton vs. Ry., 19 O. S., 260, 263.....	42
Luken vs. L. S. & M. S. Ry., 248 Ill., 377, 383.....	20
Meuer vs. Ry. 5 S. D., 568.....	40
Mo., etc., Co. vs. Cape, etc., Ry., 1 I. C. R., 607.....	21
New Jersey, etc., vs. Cent. Ry., 2 I. C. R., 84.....	21
Palmer vs. R. R., 116 N. E. (Mass.), 899.....	32
Penn. R. R. vs. Hughes, 191 U. S., 477.....	44
Penn, etc., Ry. vs. Kinney, 95 O. S., 64, 71-72.....	38
Railroad vs. Hughes, 191 U. S., 477.....	44
Railroad vs. O'Keefe, 63 Ill. App., 102.....	40
Railroad vs. Shepperd, 56 O. S., 68.....	39
Railroad vs. Shepperd, 56 O. S., 68.....	42
Railway vs. Beggs, 85 Ill., 80.....	40

INDEX—CONT'D.

	PAGE
Railway vs. Chatman, 244 U. S., 276.....	26
Railway vs. Curran, 19 O. S., 1.....	39
Railway vs. Kinney, 95 O. S., 64.....	38
Railway vs. Maucher—See Chicago, etc., Ry. vs Maucher.	34
Railway vs. Mundy, 21 Ind., 48.....	40
Railway vs. Pitecock, 82 Ark., 441.....	35
Railway vs. Pontius, 19 O. S., 221.....	39
Railway vs. Read, 37 Ill., 484.....	40
Railway vs. Schuyler, 227 U. S., 601.....	43
Railway vs. State of Arizona—See S. Pac. R. R. vs. Stat. of Ariz.	19
Railway vs. Stevens, 95 U. S., 655.....	31
Railway vs. Texas, 204 U. S., 403.....	21
Railway vs. Thompson, 234 U. S., 576.....	25
Railway vs. Thompson, 234 U. S., 576.....	32
Smith vs. Ry., 194 Fed., 79.....	23
Smith vs. Ry., 194 Fed., 79.....	24
Smith vs. Ry., 194 Fed., 79.....	42
So. Pac. Ry. vs. Schuyler, 227 U. S., 601.....	42
So. Pac. Ry. vs. Arizona, Lawyers' Co-op. Adv. Sheets for May 15, 1919, p 384 (U. S. Sup. Ct) ..	19
St. Louis, etc., Co. vs. C. B. & Q. Ry., 11 I. C. R., 82...	21
Tripp vs. M. C. R. R., 238 Fed., 449.....	27
Turman vs. Ry., 86 S. E. (So. Car.), 655.....	40
U. S. Comp. Stat., §8563 et seq. (Hepburn Act)...	12
U. S. Comp. Stat., §8563 et seq. (Hepburn Act)...	28
U. S. Comp. Stat., §8563 et seq. (Hepburn Act)...	41
U. S. Stat. at L. 34, p. 584 (Hepburn Act).....	12
U. S. Stat. at L. 34, p. 584 (Hepburn Act).....	28
U. S. Stat. at L. 34, p 584 (Hepburn Act).....	41
Walther vs. So. Pac., 159 Cal., 769.....	31
Walther vs. So. Pac., 159 Cal., 769.....	40
White vs. St. Louis R. R., 86 S. W. (Tex. Civ. App.) 962.	20
Whitney vs. R. R., 102 Fed., 850.....	30
Wiley vs. Grand Trunk Ry., 227 Fed., 127.....	27
Wiley vs. Grand Trunk Ry., 227 Fed., 127.....	44